



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,978	01/04/2002	Adam Roach	1005-0013	9505

27045 7590 03/29/2005

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR C11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/038,978

Applicant(s)

ROACH ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/21/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application filed on January 04, 2002.
2. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed July 21, 2003, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Foti (Pub. No.: US 2002/0194378 A1).

Art Unit: 2126

6. As to claim 17, Foti teaches the invention as claimed including an architecture for a communications node (*e.g., terminal- A 10; para. 0032*) in a Session Initiation Protocol telecommunications network (*e.g., the Session Initiation Protocol; para. 0030*), said node performing a plurality of call-control functions (*e.g., sends a SIP Invite message to the P-CSCF... forwards the Invite message to the I-CSCF...sends a SIP Invite to the message 35 to the S-CSCF 20 ; para. 0034*) using a common operating system (*e.g., an original network 11; para. 0032*) and being implemented on a single physical platform (*e.g., see fig. 1*), said architecture comprising:

means for performing application-level logic corresponding to the plurality of call-control functions (*para. 0034*);

means for interfacing a plurality of SIP functional blocks with the application-level logic blocks (*e.g., HSS 16; fig. 1*), selected ones of said SIP functional blocks being operable to perform selected ones of the call-control functions when interfaced with selected ones of the application-level logic blocks (*e.g., the I-CSCF 24 sends a query to the HSS 16...find Terminal-B's serving CSCF; para. 0035*); and

means for mapping into groups (*paras. 0031 & 0042*), the plurality of application-level logic blocks and the plurality of SIP functional blocks, each of said groups defining a different one of the plurality of call-control functions performed by the node (*paras. 0042 and 0043 and fig. 1*).

7. As to claim 1, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Foti further teaches at least one mapping table (*e.g., address translation table 73, fig. 2*).

Art Unit: 2126

8. As to claim 2, Foti teaches the mapping table includes groups of network addresses for application-level logic blocks and for functional blocks in the common engine module (*para. 0031*), each of said groups of addresses identifying a selected application-level logic block (*para. 0032*) and at least one functional block in the common engine module that together perform the call-control function corresponding to the selected application-level logic block (*para. 0034*).

9. As to claim 4, Foti teaches the telecommunications network utilizes call-control signaling based on the Session Initiation Protocol, and the plurality of application-level logic blocks include logic blocks for a Call State Control Function (*e.g., Call State Control Function; paras. 0032 & 0034 and fig.1*).

10. As to claim 5, Foti teaches the plurality of functional blocks in the common engine module include a plurality of SIP behavior functions and a SIP stack that performs reliability and error-checking functions associated with signal communications with the communications node (*para. 0043*).

11. As to claim 6, Foti teaches the plurality of SIP behavior functions includes a proxy function (*e.g., a Proxy Call State Function; para. 0032*), a User Agent Server function (*e.g., a Serving CSCF; para. 0032*), and a User Agent Client function (*e.g., Interrogating CSCF; para. 0032*).

12. As to claim 7, Foti teaches at least one of the application-level logic blocks includes a Registrar SIP behavior function (*para. 0034*).

13. As to claim 8, Foti teaches the SIP stack includes a plurality of portable units (*see fig. 2*), said portable units including: a transaction manager (*e.g., 21a; fig.2*); a parser (*e.g., 72; fig.2*); and a utility package (*e.g., 71, 78; fig.2*)

Art Unit: 2126

14. As to claim 9, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Foti further teaches:

an application-level logic block corresponding to the P-CSCF (*e.g.*, *P-CSCF*; *fig. 1*);
an application-level logic block corresponding to the I-CSCF (*e.g.*, *I-CSCF*; *fig. 1*);
an application-level logic block corresponding to the S-CSCF (*e.g.*, *S-CSCF*; *fig. 1*); and
a common engine module (*e.g.*, *HSS 16*; *fig. 1*) interfaced with the application-level logic blocks, said engine module comprising: a plurality of SIP behavior functions and a plurality of SIP stack functions (*para. 0034*), selected SIP behavior functions and selected SIP stack functions being operable to perform the functions of a P-CSCF, I-CSCF, or S-CSCF when interfaced with an appropriate application-level logic block corresponding to the P-CSCF, I-CSCF, or S-CSCF (*paras. 0035 & 0036*).

15. As to claims 11 and 12, they include the same limitations as claims 6 and 7 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

16. As to claim 13, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Foti further teaches assigning a network logic-block address to each of the application-level logic blocks (*paras. 0031 & 0042*); assigning a network address to each of the SIP stack functions and call-control behavior functions (*paras. 0034 & 0035*).

17. As to claims 15 and 16, they include the same limitations as claims 6 and 7 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2126

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. Claims 3, 10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Foti** in view of **Wang** (Pub. No.: US 2002/0131395 A1).

20. As to claim 3, Wang teaches a plurality of servlet Application Programming Interfaces that are operable to provide a plurality of supplementary user services (*para. 0043*); and a servlet manager (*para. 0044*) interfaced with the plurality of servlet APIs and with the plurality of application-level logic blocks, said manager being operable to provide selected ones of the supplementary user services to any one of the application-level logic blocks.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wang and Foti because Wang's teaching would have provided the capability for supporting the functionality to interact with Call Server, Web Server and Media Servers.

21. As to claims 10 and 14, they include the same limitations as claim 3 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Riikonen et al. (US 6694145) teaches "Synchronization of signaling messages and multimedia content loading."

- Donovan et al. (US 6615236) teaches "SIP-based feature control."

- Womack et al. (US 6438114) teaches "Method and apparatus for enabling multimedia calls using session initiation protocol."

- Cloud et al. (US 5634127) teaches "Methods and apparatus for implementing a message driven processor in a client-server environment."

- Tsang et al. "Accessing networked appliances using the Session Initiation Protocol" 2001 IEEE, pp. 1080-1085.

- Geppert et al. "Collaboration-based design- Exemplified by the Internet Session Initiation Protocol " 2001 IEEE, pp. 158-167.

23. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The

Art Unit: 2126

examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.

26. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents

P O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Van H. Nguyen